

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter. The future of our democracy depends on this. It seems to me that it is getting harder to get a complete range of thoughtful views on issues that are important, especially on the national and international level.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. Large companies, obligated only to profit, are clearly directing and exposing us to news in ways that benefit their interests, which do not always coincide with the public's interest. We have a set up here that is the antithesis of the free market that is supposedly operating. Proper regulation of situations like this is crucial to our ability to participate in this democracy. Their actions show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.